

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

14 February 1951

MEMORANDUM FOR: DIRECTOR OF TRAINING

SUBJECT: Proposed Curriculum for General Intelligence Training

25X1A9A

1. [REDACTED] has left with me a copy of "Proposed Curriculum for General Intelligence Training," dated 7 February and asked for my comments.

2. The following thoughts occur to me as of possible use to you in establishing necessary training programs for this Agency:

a. It seems to me that the needs for training in this Agency, in so far as they may be met by a Central Training School, are of three types:

(1) orientation

Quite obviously orientation is very superficial and general and requires very little of the employee's time.

(2) vocational or trade

Vocational or trade training centers on meeting specific needs to do specific jobs. This type of training involves identifying the needs as to the amount and kind of training required and providing for that in the most effective and efficient way.

(3) professional

I do not believe professional training should be the responsibility of this Agency, at least to the extent of providing the training school for it. A positive recruitment program should secure professionally trained people. Filling the pipeline in recruitment with properly trained people is a related but separable problem. In so far as adequate professional training has not been achieved at the time this Agency hires a man it would appear that additional professional training could be arranged while he is in service through the use of local universities; in some cases it may be a good investment to provide a leave of absence with or without pay so that an employee may further his professional training. Obviously this thought is closely tied in to the development of any career system for CIA.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

b. The proposed curriculum which stimulates the foregoing remarks is addressed at all three of these kinds of training and therefore is not desirable in my view.

c. In addition I believe there underlies this paper a conception that intelligence is a peculiar discipline and that the employees must be indoctrinated so to consider their work. By this I mean there is the implication that intelligence is as different from social science as mechanical engineering is different from social science. I don't agree with this implication. To me intelligence is only one of the necessary elements required in order to achieve intelligent public policy. The points of view required in intelligence and the mechanics and procedures essential to it must be learned by our personnel so that CIA's mission and the mission of the Federal Intelligence System may be achieved; however, this need not be overdone in order to make the point.

d. The foregoing reasoning adds up to the following positive recommendations:

(1) Orientation and indoctrination can be done with relatively large groups. Even here, however, I would suggest that we not lump together all the people in all kinds of functions and at all levels of responsibility.

(2) There should be training in specific skills, for example, communications' training, IBM machine training, contacts' training, etc. Whether this can be done best by a training school or by offices responsible for the functions I am not prepared to say.

(3) It might be very useful from time to time to have practitioners or students in the field of intelligence speak to select groups in the Agency with regard to certain refinements of the intelligence function and its processes. By and large I should think this would be most provocative and stimulating if the approach was not the descriptive but the problematical.

e. Rather than seeking to inculcate the notion that intelligence is of a totally different breed from other disciplines required in the social sciences I should think it much more accurate and broadening as well as useful to the United States Government if we were to assist CIA personnel to visualize themselves and their talents to be an integral part of a public policy process in which functional segregations merely reflect the needs and conveniences of organization. This need not do violence to the establishment of a career system for CIA. It should be recognized, however, that the need for career service as distinct from the civil service largely stems from the peculiarities of the covert operations, and this is by no means all of CIA. If it is good to have a career service in CIA its underlying

motivation should not be to develop the cliquish characteristics already observable in other career services, to wit, the Foreign Service. Migrations from one service to another in order to more fully exploit the capabilities of people and thereby produce a greater increment for the Government is not only desirable but really imperative. In this connection witness the strain and stress which the Foreign Service is now undergoing, both with regard to broadening of the members of the service, recruiting of people into the service at middle age, and the possible merger of State departmental and Foreign Service. This is the thesis of the ever expanding horizon as opposed to the conception that there is a given body of knowledge, practices, and processes which as in the field of carpentry are by and large laid out beforehand and which the apprentice sets himself to acquire in the fullness of his career.

JAMES Q. REBER
Acting Assistant Director,
Intelligence Coordination